

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to because it is not clear how the seal can contact the housing bore or cavity. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim 20 is objected to because the parenthetical claim status is incorrect. Appropriate correction has been made in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claims 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 has been withdrawn thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 20 has been amended to properly introduce the "plastically deformed housing material".

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tackett (US 5,531,513).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 12 to clarify that the seal (4) contacts the piston (8), the stepped diameter (2) of the housing bore, and the cover (6) and that seal (4) also is fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (6).

Applicant respectfully submits that Tackett (Fig. 2) does not show seal (combination of 202,203) being fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (210). Instead, a collar (215) fixes Tackett's seal in position. Tackett's arrangement is different than the structure that is described by claim 12 and therefore can not anticipate claim

12. For this reason Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Applicant respectfully submits that Sinnl (Fig. 1) does not show a seal that simultaneously contacts the piston (8), the stepped diameter (2) of the housing bore, and the cover (6) and that is also is fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (6). Instead, Sinnl provides two seals 17. One of them is retained by the cover (at the left in Fig. 1) and the other (at the right in Fig. 1) contacts the stepped diameter and the piston. Sinnl's arrangement is different than the structure that is described by claim 12 and therefore can not anticipate claim 12. For this reason Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinz et al. (US 2005/0146210 A1).

Applicant respectfully submits that Hinz (Fig. 5) does not show a seal that simultaneously contacts the piston (4), the stepped diameter of the housing bore, and the cover (5) and that is also is fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (5). Instead, Hinz et al. provides a single seal that sits within a groove that separated from the cover. Hinz et al.'s arrangement is different than the structure that is described by claim 12 and therefore can not anticipate claim 12. For this reason Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 13, 14 and 21-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tackett (US 5,531,513) in view of Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Claims 17 and 20 are withdrawn, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinz et al. (US 2005/0146210 A1) in view of Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Claims 15-20 are withdrawn, thereby rendering their rejection moot.

With regard to Claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Hinz and Sinnl does not provide all of the elements of Claim 13 and therefore does not provide a prima facie basis of obviousness. Claim 13 depends from Claim 12, which as noted above includes the limitation that seal simultaneously contacts the piston (8), the stepped diameter (2) of the housing bore, and the cover (6) and that the seal is also fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (6).

The Examiner relies on Hinz to provide seal in such a position, however as noted above in the response to the 35 USC 102 rejection Hinz is not arranged as such. Sinnl does not make up for the shortcomings of Hinz in this regard, also as noted in its associated 35 USC 102 response above.

For this reason Applicant believes that Claim 13 is in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and prior-art rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive

AP 10724

Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants